

*Only wordplay and fantasy speculation can rationalize the idea that the Soviet Union and other brutal regimes weren't really socialist.*

I suppose then you will provide us with evidences of how historical exemplars of Socialism, such as the USSR practices what was advocated by vintage Socialists and how it actually practices their ideals?

*One tactic that today's socialists employ is to portray the lessons of history and world affairs as irrelevant to their cause. They claim that the Soviet Union, Communist China, Communist Cuba, and today's regime in Venezuela are not real examples of socialism at all. Real socialism, you may have heard them say, has never been tried.*

*What makes people think this is true? What do they mean by "socialism" and is their view even plausible?*

If you really think Venezuela, a country with thriving Private Property and a propertyless Working Class resembles Socialism in any way, it is hilarious how you have not been discredited for that statement but for the sake of building constructive criticism, lets put that claim aside for now and answer your question of how we can even consider YOUR historical exemplars of "Socialism" to be examples of authentic Socialism?

*Socialism, in a standard definition, means public ownership of the means of production, which implies the abolishing of private property and ending the capitalist system of free trade and free markets. This is often understood to mean state ownership of the means of production.*

*By that standard, the Soviet Union, Communist China, and other authoritarian regimes all count as "socialist": in every case, insurgents seized control of governments which then expropriated private farms, factories and shops from their capitalist owners — many of whom lost not only their property, but their lives. What's more, these insurgents were led by figures (Lenin, Mao, Castro, etc.) that were explicitly committed to socialist ideology.*

Their "commitment" to Socialist ideology does not necessarily entail that the system they established even was Socialism in practice, as Vladimir Lenin openly admitted his regime was a form of Statist Capitalism. It is entirely possible but should be unsurprising that Societies and ideologies can label themselves as certain terms in order to receive positive connotation. In the case of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, it still retains in its name Democracy even though the entire Society of Korea is under the Obligarchy of the Workers' Party of Korea. With this knowledge, why have you never considered that the Socialist label can be adopted by opportunists?

*Socialists try to insulate the system they advocate from this evidence of failure by using a talking point that (as we shall see) they have used since the beginning of their movement. They put a spin on the "public ownership of the means of production" definition. Real socialism, they say, doesn't mean state control of the economy; it means control by "the people," especially by the workers.*

It is according to Friedrich Engels in his text "On Authority, whereby it is stated by him that all Socialists agree that the State will disappear with the establishment of a Socialist Society, in order to make way for the real Common and Democratic control of production by the People...

*Although the proposal that "real" socialism doesn't require the use of state power might sound new or innovative to the uninitiated, a few questions and a little knowledge of history are sufficient to show it is just as much a fantasy as a perpetual motion machine.*

It has been the proposal of Socialists long before the invention of Marxism-Leninism [State ideology of the Soviet Union and the entirety of the former Eastern Bloc]. It is therefore complete nonsense to speak of the reclaiming of real Socialism/Communism as a new strategy of underground conspirators to censor their shady past.

*The economic failure, famine, and bloodshed suffered by each of these countries flowed directly from the same policies advocated by today's socialists. Just as socialists demand, businesses were torn from the hands their creators - in every case, insurgents seized control of governments which then expropriated private farms, factories and shops from their capitalist owners*

The said aftermaths are NOT FLOWED from the same policies advocated by Marxism.

The guiding ideology of the Eastern Bloc was Bolshevism, the revolutionary strategy espoused by Tkachov and Lenin that insisted for the guidance of the Working Class by a Vanugardistic minority to guide a transition towards Communism. It is a Dictatorship not of the entire Working Class but of a specialist organisation, in most cases a Political Party. This fact therefore continues to enforce the idea that Real Communism has not been attempted at since the Revolution which gave birth to a so called "Communist Society"

(Soviet Union) did not follow the Marxist program.

*First, note that the socialists paper over the coercion and even violence that would obviously need to happen to expropriate private property from peaceful citizens to set up their system in the first place. (The mask drops when they start advocating "lawbreaking and sabotage" as worthy tactics in revolutionary social change.<sup>5</sup>) By itself this calls into question any assertion that socialism can be implemented without bloodshed: socialist ends cannot be detached from socialist means.*

The violence and coercion is needed in order for that the Victorious Proletariat does not end up fighting in vain. The Proletarian Class must arm itself collectively against the Bourgeoisie and all rivalling Classes in order to assert its Authority all over its conquered territories.

You have no shame in the Capitalists [The Paris Commune, the Spartacist uprising, the democratic presidency of Salvador Allende] to hold State power and crush the Working Class, why do you reproach the Workers for using State power to assert their own Class Interests? This is one question we will get back to at the very end.

*As I've argued elsewhere at greater length, the allegation that "democratic control" ensures freedom from coercion and oppression is an old fallacy that turns on an equivocation between a government with elected representatives and a society run by majority rule. The latter is what socialists advocate when they claim that factories should be run by workers, regardless of what the factory's original creators have to say about it. This constitutes a direct violation of the rights of a minority of individuals. So if workers really do end up holding "the purse strings" of the factories and the power to make the state appeal to them, it makes little sense to say that the state would "wither away" as an entity independent of the workers.<sup>7</sup> Rather, the workers would in effect be running a state.<sup>8</sup>*

The Proletariat Class would have constituted itself as a State by definition during their initial struggle with the Bourgeois [Institution designed to hold down other Classes]. It is only after the defeat of the Bourgeois, that the Proletarian State by definition would have ceased to become a State. In the entire span of a national Workers Assembly, decision by the Majority and the free recalling of Delegates allows the Working Class to hold FULL GOVERNMENT POWER. You must confess here as Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels had exposed long ago in the infamous Communist Manifesto, that your shameless defence of the individual rights of the Bourgeois is simply an unapologetic mysticism of the Capitalist class and

their "irreplaceable value to the Proletariat." You do absolutely nothing to add to your case other than explain to everybody your true priority as the Attorney of the Capitalists!

*There is no magical entity called "the public." A society is composed of individual human beings. In reality, the only mechanism by which the actions of an entire society can be coordinated is by means of a government. And so the only way for anything resembling "the public" to systematically deprive capitalists of private property and to abolish capitalist free trade is for the state to do it. Every socialist acknowledges this, whether they advocate violent revolution to establish a collectivist state or a majority vote to establish the same.*

In a Factory Committee for example, does the entire workforce become the representative Delegate? When culminating communication between Workers on a National level, the division of labor always necessitates some form of central administration, whether it be locally or nationally.

It should be noted however that the natural characteristic of a Workers' Council State as demonstrated by those that had existed historically, it is a form of Government meant for the collective self Governing of Societies.

*"Socialism" can only mean state ownership of the means of production. There is simply no evidence that there is a way of implementing or maintaining a universal system of worker co-ops without state enforcement. (Without a state, there is no way of maintaining any kind of social system. Anarchy is incompatible with even the semblance of a peaceful social coexistence.)*

In the context of personal survival and social stability, do not you think that the Working Class is more than capable with a Workers' Council Government on the topic of collectively managing their own affairs free from Bureaucracy? In fact, why do you think the Workers are simply too incompilant with one another even when it comes to their own survival and their inevitable need for voluntary leadership when it has been proven numerous times that Humans are SOCIAL creatures? The concept of the Common man as a hopeless pawn who needs the guidance of privileged great men had existed for as long as Class Society itself has existed, during the epochs from Slavery, Serfdom and now Wage Labor. It exists solely as a way of convincing the Worker of their inherent worthlessness without their subjugation, in other words the propaganda of the ruling Class!



*This means that the Soviet Union, Communist China, Cuba, and the other catastrophic regimes of the twentieth century are the real meaning of the concept of "socialism" — as is the democratically elected but now dictatorial Chavista regime in today's Venezuela. Socialists cannot escape this reality through wordplay or fantastic speculation.*

*It is no surprise that socialism evades facts about the nature of the political system it works to achieve. The whole idea that animates the drive for socialism, the idea that human life would be improved by eliminating capitalism, is itself founded on similar evasions of basic facts.*

It is now that we must finally acknowledge a trend in the Reaction's crusade against information of real Communism being distinct from Societies that attempt to adopt its name. It is acknowledged by the Reaction that this distinction is very real, and that they will always try their best to manipulate their audience by trying to clear the line between real Communism and the Soviet socio-economic system, sometimes with great and applausable effort, but here we get the exact opposite. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republic for example was a "Socialist Society because it had practiced and implemented all Socialist ideals", but then near the very end NOT ONLY do we get their acknowledgement that real  
Socialism

is in fact very distinct from the socio-economic policies of the Soviet Union, but in the middle of their "factual presentation" they even had the confidence to claim that the Socialist revolution advocated for privileged insurgents seizing power on behalf of Workers! This piece of work was so lazy that they had not even tried to convince the audience as to why Stateless/Real Socialism was an unworkable form that could in practice only be substituted by a Statist variation, but instead only chose to completely give a meaningless critique with no apparent reason. It was not even attempted by the Ayn Rand institute to explain how the USSR supposedly, authentically practiced a form of Socialism advocated by its original founding Fathers, simply because they could not. What they preach here in this work of theirs goes against historical facts and they, as the Ministry of Truth knows very well of, but chooses to take advantage of the mainstream crusade of censoring Socialism to come up with their own ridiculous propaganda whereby it featured a defeated Straw man representing ideals which Socialists and Communists historically have always stood against.